

Vol. XIV No. 3

Spring 1992

Creation

Social Science

and Humanities

QUARTERLY



CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY

The Creation Social Science and Humanities Society (CSSHS) was incorporated in Wichita, Kansas, in 1977. The CSSHS is educational, and will promote and disseminate information on the implications of the Biblical creation model of origins for the social sciences and humanities, with emphasis on the development of these disciplines in accordance with the rapidly emerging and increasingly well established natural scientific models of Biblical creation.

The **Quarterly Journal** is directed toward teachers and students of the social sciences and humanities, especially in institutions of higher learning. The CSSHS may also publish books, monographs, and other writings, and sponsor speakers, seminars, and research projects related to its educational purpose.

IRS tax-exempt status was granted December 30, 1977. All contributions are tax-deductible.

Voting membership is initially by invitation of the Board of Directors of CSSHS to candidates eligible on the following basis.

a. persons with at least a baccalaureate degree in the social sciences or humanities; or

b. persons 18 years old or over, who have held office in another creation-science organization with beliefs, substantially identical with those contained in the CSSHS **Statement of Belief**, for at least one year immediately prior to applying for membership in the CSSHS; or who have a commitment to our belief and work clearly evidenced by their record of actual involvement. Voting membership dues are \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

Sustaining membership is open to those who subscribe to the C.S.S.H.S. Statement of Belief. Sustaining membership dues are \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

Both voting and sustaining memberships include subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly**, and are reckoned as beginning and ending in September.

Non-members may subscribe to the **CSSH Quarterly** at the rate of \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

Officers: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman, *President*; Mrs. Diane Powell, *Vice-President*; Mrs. Ellen Myers, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

Editor: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman.

Board of Reference: Dr. Duane T. Gish, *San Diego, California*; Rev. Walter Lang, *Minneapolis Minnesota*; Dr. Henry M. Morris, *San Diego, California*; Dr. Harold S. Slusher, *El Paso, Texas*; Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Jr., *Winona Lake, Indiana*; Dr. Clifford A. Wilson, *Mt. Waverly, Victoria, Australia*.

ISSN 0740-3399

Cover Art by Nellie Myers

DEVOTIONAL

"And they fortified Jerusalem unto the broad wall."

—*Nehemiah 3:8*

Cities well fortified have broad walls, and so had Jerusalem in her glory. The New Jerusalem must, in like manner, be surrounded and preserved by a broad wall of nonconformity to the world, and *separation* from its customs and spirit. The tendency of these days is to break down the holy barrier, and make the distinction between the church and the world merely nominal. Professors are no longer strict and Puritanical, questionable literature is read on all hands, frivolous pastimes are currently indulged, and a general laxity threatens to deprive the Lord's peculiar people of those sacred singularities which separate them from sinners. It will be an ill day for the church and the world when the proposed amalgamation shall be complete, and the sons of God and daughters of men shall be as one: then shall another deluge of wrath be ushered in. Beloved reader, be it your aim in heart, in word, in dress, in action to maintain the broad wall, remembering that the friendship of this world is enmity against God.

The broad wall afforded a pleasant place of *resort* for the inhabitants of Jerusalem, from which they could command prospects of the surrounding country. This reminds us of the Lord's exceeding broad commandments, in which we walk at liberty in communion with Jesus, overlooking the scenes of earth, and looking out towards the glories of heaven. Separated from the world, and denying ourselves all ungodliness and fleshly lusts, we are nevertheless not in prison, nor restricted within narrow bounds; nay, we walk at liberty, because we keep His precepts. Come, reader, this evening walk with God in His statutes. As friend met friend upon the city wall, so meet thou thy God in the way of holy prayer and meditation. The bulwarks of salvation thou hast a right to traverse, for thou art a freeman of the royal burgh, a citizen of the metropolis of the universe.

— Charles Spurgeon

LETTER

Dear Editor:

I am writing this letter to thank you for the help you have given and also to wish you a happy new year.

The *CSSHQ* has been a source of knowledge not only to me but also to my friends and also to my daily walk with God. Thank you very much and I will always remember you in my prayers.

Olusoji Ilori
Clinic St. David
6 Alufa Aminu Street
Pedro Somulu
Lagos, Nigeria

ANNOUNCEMENTS CREATION-SCIENCE SUMMER CONFERENCES SCHEDULED

Two excellent creation-science conferences are set for this summer:

The **1992 Twin-Cities Creation Conference**, July 29 to August 1, 1992, Northwestern College, Roseville, Minnesota. The conference will feature nationally known creation-science speakers, and is designed for the scientist, pastor, teacher, and informed Christian. For registration information write: 1459 Lone Oak Road, Eagan Mn. 55121, or call 612-454-1988.

International Conference on Science and Belief, August 11-15, 1992; Pascal Centre, Redeemer College, Ancaster, ON Canada L9G 3N6. This five-day conference is planned for scholars with a professional interest in the relationship between science and belief. The first half of the conference will focus on general metaphysical beliefs while the second half will emphasize Christian beliefs.

REASON, FAITH AND CREATION IN THE MATURE PHILOSOPHY OF LEV SHESTOV

Ellen Myers

The Russian Jewish philosopher Lev Shestov (1866-1938) is almost unknown in America and even in Western Europe where he settled after 1919 and wrote his mature work. Despite his great erudition and superb style his philosophy found few followers. This was so because Shestov did not share his generation's idolatry of science, technology, progress, and above all of man's own autonomous reason as the lawgiver for thought and life.

Shestov rebelled against the impersonalism common to all rationalistic philosophies from the Greeks to the moderns, and he could not tolerate their allegedly absolute "uncreated truths" or "Necessity." Over against them he set the "created truths" of the sovereign, personal God of the Bible, the God to Whom all things are possible. In his most extreme formulation, this God is able to cause something that happened in the past not to have happened, or to make 2 plus 2 add up to not-4; a truth is absolute only when rooted and grounded in the Person of God the Creator Himself. In a world teeming with religious unbelief, cataclysmic social upheavals, and mass murder, torture and slavery under Communism and Nazism, Shestov came to believe that

Only a reappropriation of the faith of Scripture—which proclaims that man and the universe are the creation of an omnipotent, personal God and that this God made man in His own image, endowing him with freedom and creative power—could ... liberate contemporary humanity from the horrors of existence.¹

Because Shestov's last and greatest book, *Athens and Jerusalem*, presents this conviction most unequivocally and thoroughly, it has been chosen as the only basis for the discussion of his thought.

The Foreword already reveals Shestov's extensive knowledge of the important philosophers of all ages. He quotes Aristotle, Bayle, Leibnitz, Descartes, and Kant to raise his first crucial point, namely, that "the problem of knowledge, or more exactly, knowledge as a problem, not only has never drawn the attention of the most notable representatives of philosophical thought but has repelled them" (*Athens and Jerusalem*, p.51). Philosophers understand that this world and human reason must be autonomous and self-contained if they want to "do philosophy"; no unpredictable higher being can be allowed to interfere with their own "truths." As Shestov says, if "the eternal truths are not autonomous but depend on the will, or more precisely, the pleasure of the Creator,

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XIV, No. 3 (Spring 1992)

how could philosophy or what we call philosophy be possible?" (ibid., p.50) The "problem of knowledge" exists for philosophers because autonomous reason cannot even prove the elementary proposition that objects outside our own selves actually exist. They might be mere figments of our imagination or dreamlike illusion as the far Eastern religions have taught for millennia. Reason can only *postulate* the real existence of that which is "not-self," or else accept it "on faith," that is, by denying its own universal validity. Of course, whether we are Hindus, Buddhists, modern "New Age" mystics, philosophers, or common unlearned people, we must all act as if things outside ourselves really did exist in order to live; but this argument from experience only irritates would-be autonomous thinkers because it challenges their autonomy and is factual proof that all men do and must "live by faith."

Common sense tempts us to ridicule the "problem" involved here as fictitious, but the recognition of the "not-self-as real" is threatened everywhere today by the far Eastern religious concept of all observed phenomena as illusion ("maya") which is flooding Western society and thought. Hence Shestov's substantiation of reality as truly existing and not an illusion is particularly relevant today. He points to the personal, sovereign God and Creator of the Bible as the Maker, Sustainer and hence Validator of reality:

Kant ... wanted people to consider him ... a Christian philosopher. But for all his piety, he could not accept the idea that God can and must be placed above the truths, that God can be sought and found in our world. Why ... did it not occur to him to ask whether the certitude with which he affirmed the autonomy of the truth ... did not flow from the "dogma" of the sovereignty of reason, a dogma devoid of all foundation and one which is ... perhaps—the death of the human spirit? ... the truths of experience, whatever they may bring, always irritate us, just as does the "supreme being" (that is to say, *deus ex machina*) even when he wisely introduces into us eternal truths concerning what exists and what does not exist. (ibid., pp.54-55)

To his great credit Shestov insisted upon this answer while standing virtually alone long before the rise of the modern biblical creation movement.

Second, Shestov strongly revolts against the cold impersonalism of a world without the personal God of Scripture who cares for man:

The Psalmist could cry to God, but the man *qui sola ratione ducitur* (who is led by reason alone) knows well that it is absolutely useless to cry to God from the depths. If you have fallen into an abyss, try to get out of it as best you can, but forget what the Bible has told us throughout the centuries—that there is somewhere, "in Heaven," a supreme and omnipotent being who is interested in your fate, who can help you, and who is ready to do so. (ibid., p.58)

Shestov loathed the philosophers' endless debate about their alleged "truths," typified by Plato's statement that "The greatest good of man is to discourse daily about virtue." He accepted instead "the biblical legend of the fall of the first man and the Apostle (St. Paul) who interprets this legend by declaring that 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin.'" (ibid., p.65) He wanted to "(put) to proof the pretensions to the possession of truth which reason or speculative philosophy make" so that "the tree of knowledge no longer chokes the tree of life." (ibid., pp.65-66) He called the philosophers' autonomous ethics and "constraining truths" which exalted themselves against God "the abomination of desolation," and said that to find God one must go to Scriptural faith,

that dimension of thought where truth abandons itself fearlessly and joyously to the entire disposition of the Creator: "Thy will be done!" The will of Him who, on his side, fearlessly and with sovereign power returns to the believer his lost power: ... "what things soever ye desire ... ye shall have them" (Mark 11:24) ...

Faith, only the faith that looks to the Creator and that He inspires, radiates from itself the supreme and decisive truths concerning what is and what is not. Reality is transfigured. The heavens glorify the Lord, the Prophets and apostles cry in ecstasy, "O death, where is thy sting? Hell, where is thy victory?" And all announce: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him" (I Corinthians, 2:9). (ibid., pp.68, 69)

Shestov proposed a true religious philosophy, which would be "a turning away from knowledge and a surmounting by faith ... of the false fear of the unlimited will of the Creator, that fear which the tempter suggested to Adam and which he has transmitted to all of us." Man cannot live on the basis of his own autonomous reason for his fate is then simply the Creator's warning to Adam, "you will die," writ large:

Human wisdom is foolishness before God, and the wisdom of men ... is the greatest of sinners. Whatsoever is not of faith is sin. As for the philosophy that does not dare to rise above autonomous knowledge and autonomous ethics, the philosophy that bows down willlessly and helplessly before the material and ideal "data" discovered by reason and that permits them to pillage and plunder the "one thing necessary"—this philosophy does not lead man towards truth but forever turns him away from it. (ibid., pp.70-71)

Shestov shows that autonomous reason will admit the sovereignty of God at most only once, at the beginning of the world: "The founder and guide of all things ... always obeys, but has commanded only once." So thought Seneca, so thought the ancients, so all of us think. ... the Creator of the world has Himself become subordinate to Necessity which ... has become the sov-

ereign of the universe." (ibid., p.85) However, this "Necessity" of the philosophers which subjugates God also reduces men to mere "stones endowed with consciousness," as Spinoza said. (ibid., p.103) It is only when we recognize ourselves as such helpless and miserable stones in some abyss of despair that we may first begin to truly inquire and reflect. Only then do we perhaps cry out to a God transcending Necessity and the world absolutely as the only One able to rescue us, and so find Him.

Man's autonomous philosophies are also tested by the finality of universal, inescapable death in this world. Facing death, man asks who or what determines his fate, and he realizes that

As long as we obtain no answer to this question, all our truths will have only a conditional significance. ... (our fate is) at the disposal perhaps of a living being who feels and chooses or, perhaps, of something that is interested in nothing and no one. ... And if this indifferent or inanimate "something" is the source of life and truth, then what meaning, what importance, can human choice have?

... it is obvious that *on the plane where these questions were born and developed we shall obtain no answer. Or worse still: on this plane all these questions are decided in advance.* There is no "who" at the sources of being; therefore there is no "who" at the sources of truth. (*Athens and Jerusalem*, p.111)

This means that "By himself man can no more obtain faith than he could obtain his own being." (ibid., p.129) Faith in God is not "only a particular form of knowledge," the "knowledge" of autonomous reason and philosophy, as Hegel taught; on the contrary, "the Scriptures, the Old as well as the New Testament ... do not demand but presuppose faith in what is incompatible, completely incompatible, with knowledge." (ibid.) But the birth of knowledge, Shestov reiterates, was "a violation of man," and it is also "a violation of the spirit," because it reduces to the contingent and the finite "the marriage at Cana, the resurrection of Lazarus, the poisoning of Socrates and the poisoning of a dog." (ibid., pp.130, 131) The philosophers' sacrosanct Necessity is a Medusa which turns them who see her into stones. It makes prayer an exercise in passivity before the inescapable, and changes repentance into forgetfulness, whereas prayer must address a truly existing personal God to have meaning, and "repentance is repentance precisely because it cannot come to terms with what has happened." (ibid., p.135) Having ruled out the meaningful existence and sovereignty of the personal God of Scripture, autonomous reason/philosophy has somehow passed

All reality ... into a flattening mill and forcibly introduced (it) into that two-dimensional thought, which ... considers as an absurdity everything that bears the stamp of the unforeseen, of freedom, of originality, everything that seeks and desires not passive being but the creative action that is not bound or deter-

mined by anything. (ibid., p.137)

In order to maintain its own autonomy, philosophy and its vaunted Necessity cannot "admit the idea of purpose (finality) in nature." (ibid., p.143) Elsewhere Shestov deals more clearly and sharply with the dominant Darwinian evolutionism of his day:

If one had proven to the Apostle (St. Paul) with all the required evidence, like "two times two makes four," that man is descended from the ape, neither proofs nor evidence would have convinced him. He would perhaps have repeated Dostoevsky's words, "but what does it matter to me?" Probably, however, he would have recalled the Bible: "... as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee." In other words, if you believe that you are of God, you are of God; if you believe that you come from an ape, you come from an ape: "the righteous shall live by faith." (ibid., pp.348-349)

Here Shestov expresses doubt about evolutionist "evidence," and praises faith in the words of the Bible. He even dares say that a man is what he believes he is, an unreasonable statement on the surface, yet shown to be true in fact: the Nazis believed themselves to be "blond beasts" and acted as such, and today's believers in their own animal descent advocate and practice, abortion, euthanasia and sterilization on these same grounds.

Shestov believes that Adam's fall in Eden involved descent into the philosophers' autonomous reason. One of his reasons for this conviction is the modern philosophers' own praise of the serpent and rejection of God. He quotes Hegel's statements that the serpent did not deceive man, and that "The fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil—of the knowledge that is of reason out of itself—is the universal principle of philosophy for all later times." Then Shestov correctly adds:

It is not only Hegel who thinks thus. All of us are persuaded that the serpent who enticed our primal forefathers to taste of the fruits of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil did not deceive them, that the deceiver was God who had forbidden Adam to eat of these fruits in the fear that the man would become like God. ... If it is necessary to choose between God ... and the serpent ... , the educated European cannot hesitate; he will follow the serpent. (ibid., p.165)

This attitude goes back to Socrates. Like Socrates, who at least knew he knew nothing, all the philosophers "were completely hypnotized by the idea that (an) order which depends on no one must exist ... (and) the task of philosophy consists of revealing the necessary relationships of things ... " (ibid., p.168) But if Necessity rules, then why not live as one pleases—"if the dead rise not, let us eat and drink (I Corinthians, 15:32)?" (ibid., p.169) This, of course, is to abandon meaningful ethics, as the Stoics and Plotinus ("the last of the great philosophers of antiquity") understood. Yet

if one clings to a meaningful ethics and faces utter misfortune "stochically," then is not any "happiness" promised by wisdom—"happiness" while one's daughters are raped, one's sons murdered, one's homeland destroyed—"worse than the worst misfortunes that strike mortal men?" (ibid., p.175)

The question of a meaningful ethics involves man's choice between good and evil. Philosophers assume that this was always the choice. Not so, says Shestov in perhaps his most important philosophical deduction from the Genesis record of man before the fall:

But evil might not have existed in the universe at all. Whence did it come? Do not Necessity and the capacity for choosing between good and evil testify, not to our freedom ... but to our enslavement, to our loss of freedom? The free being (Adam before the fall) possesses the sovereign right to give names to all things, and they will bear the names that he confers on them (Genesis 2:19). The free man might not have authorized evil to enter the world, but now man must be content with "choosing" between the evil that is not subordinated to him and the good that is likewise no longer in his power. (ibid., p.190)

This biblical concept of the freedom to do only good is analogous to the freedom of our Lord, God and Father Who is good and only does good. Man was created originally in the image and likeness of this God, and is meant to be restored to this perfection in Christ by faith. This view of true freedom is "the glorious liberty of the children of God" spoken of in Romans 8:21 and longed for by all creation. This true precept of freedom according to biblical creation must be embraced and held up high before the world by Christian believers.

How, then, may fallen man be delivered from the presumptuousness of autonomous reason into the freedom of God and His redeemed children? Deliverance, Shestov says, is possible only by God. Shestov quotes extensively from Martin Luther over against both worldly and would-be Christian scholastic philosophers:

Luther said, "man presumptuously claims to be holy and righteous." The virtue and happiness of the man who by his own powers can turn neither to God nor to immortality, for reason has enchained his will and obliged him to go where Necessity pushes him, appeared to Luther as the fall of man, as original sin. The idea of law and order, on which all our thought is based, is also for him the worst of errors. The source of truth is found where human reason least expects it; and it is there also that one can attain the good which we have exchanged for philosophical happiness.

Luther calls this source "faith." ... "Nothing is more inimical to faith than law and reason, and these two cannot be overcome without great effort and labor, yet they must be overcome if you wish to be saved. ...

the gospel leads us beyond and above the light of law and of reason into the darkness of faith ..."

What Socrates and Spinoza glorified as "our better part" and "the divine light" appear to Luther to be *bellua qua non occisa homo non potest vivere* (the monster without whose killing man cannot live). (ibid., pp.202-203)

Shestov points out that according to Luther the law "is not given to man to guide him but only to make him aware of his weakness and impotence"; man could not go where he wished to go, and took "appearances and illusions for truths." This doctrine of the bondage of man's will was unacceptable and absurd "both to the learned Erasmus and to the Catholic theologians nurtured on the Bible." (ibid., p.205) Nietzsche and Kierkegaard, Shestov says, understood with Luther that there existed a "strict bond ... between knowledge and ... the loss of freedom." From this Nietzsche evolved his irrationalist anti-Christian master morality, and Kierkegaard a "Christian" existentialism which yet "never succeeded in escaping from the power of the Socratic ideas." (ibid., p.226)

Shestov elaborates this judgment on Kierkegaard in a lengthy and intriguing discussion of his works. Ultimately Kierkegaard's error stems from his false understanding of what was involved in Adam's fall:

Contrary to what Kierkegaard asserts, it must be said that it was precisely the fruits of the tree of knowledge which lulled the human mind to sleep. This is why God forbade Adam to eat of them. The words that God addressed to Adam, "as for the tree of knowledge of good and of evil, you shall not eat of it, for on the day that you eat thereof you shall surely die," are in complete disagreement with our conception of knowledge as well as our conception of good and evil. But their meaning is perfectly clear and admits of no tortured interpretation. I repeat once more: they constitute the only true critique of pure reason that has ever been formulated here on earth. ...

Freedom consists in the force and power not to admit evil into the world. God, the freest being, does not choose between good and evil. And the man whom He had created did not choose either, for there was nothing there to choose: evil did not exist in paradise. Only when man, obeying the suggestion of a force hostile and incomprehensible to us, held forth his hand towards the tree did his mind fall asleep and did he become that feeble being, subject to alien principles, that we now see. This is the meaning of the "fall" according to the Bible. (ibid., pp.255, 256)

Kierkegaard also attributes his concept of "anxiety" falsely to the alleged "Nothingness" of innocence, whereas the Bible states that "shame and anxiety came only after the fall and proceed not

from innocence but from knowledge. Thus anxiety is not the reality of freedom but the manifestation of the loss of freedom." (ibid., p.257) Because Kierkegaard and Nietzsche endeavored to lead man to that "happiness" and equanimity offered by philosophy/autonomous reason in the face of unbearable "Necessity," they are for Shestov guilty of "the most terrible, the mortal, unpardonable sin (which) consists in this acceptance." (ibid., p.265)

As is already obvious from Shestov's approval of Luther, he believes that but for a few exceptions the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages also partook of the idolatry of autonomous reason because it leaned upon Greek philosophy, especially Aristotle, "as a kind of second 'Old Testament.'" (ibid., p.272) The moderns in turn are indebted to the scholastics by way of Descartes and Leibnitz. Shestov makes heavy use of the work of Etienne Gilson on medieval philosophy in substantiating his charge that this would-be Christian thought system departed from true Christian philosophy founded exclusively upon the Bible. Gilson himself had glimpses of this fact:

The metaphysics of the Book of Exodus penetrates to the very heart of epistemology, in that it makes the intellect and its subject dependent on God, from whom both draw their existence. What it brings us here that is new is the notion, unknown to the ancients, of a created truth, spontaneously ordained by the Being who is at the same time the end and the beginning, for it is by Him alone that it exists, as He alone can perfect and fulfill it. (ibid., p.275)

Shestov wholeheartedly agrees: "The philosophy of the Book of Exodus tells us that truth, like everything that exists, was created by God, that it is always in His power and that it is in this precisely that its high value and its superiority in relation to the uncreated truths of the Greeks consists." (ibid., p.277) However, while we need not accuse "the pious thinkers of the Middle Ages ... (to) admit the thought that truth was on the side of the tempting serpent," they did so implicitly when, "concerned no doubt with defending man against the arbitrariness of God," they attempted to transform "the truths received from God 'without any shadow of proof' into proven truths, into self-evident truths—as the principles of the Greeks demanded of them." (ibid., pp.280, 281) They, like any worldly philosophers, were not satisfied with God's word itself but craved validation of God's word by this or that principle brought up by autonomous reason:

This is precisely what the first man wished when he stretched forth his hand to the tree of knowledge ... He also wishes "to know," not "to believe"; he saw in faith a kind of diminution, an injury to his human dignity, and he was certain of this when the serpent told him that after he had eaten of the fruits of the forbidden tree he would become like God—knowing. (ibid., p.282)

What we all are tempted to do, Shestov is saying, is to de-

pend on and bow to our own "knowledge" or to impersonal "principles" rather than the sovereign Person of the Creator. We would rather die than live by faith in Him. Even the medieval would-be Christian philosophers (except for such as Peter Damian and one or two others) and the medieval mystics "never wished to see and never came to understand that the original sin consisted in the fact that man had tasted of the fruits of the tree of knowledge." (ibid., p.283) Unlike they, truly Christian thinkers must abide by created truths only: "We must, before everything else, reject the basic categories of Greek thought, tear out from our being all the postulates of our 'natural knowledge' and our 'natural morality.'" (ibid., p.288) Eventually scholasticism, unable to bear the dichotomy of both Greek and biblical epistemology, was eclipsed by the modern formulations of Greek thought/autonomous reason only. The climax of scholasticism was reached, as is well known, by St. Thomas Aquinas, who knew but did not hearken to the warning of Isaiah: "If you will not believe, you will not endure," replacing them by the faulty translation "If you will not believe, you will not understand" (Isaiah 7:9). (ibid., p.298) Many biblical statements which run counter to certain principles of autonomous reason were embarrassing to medieval thinkers; thus, for example, the six days of creation were called an "allegory" already by St. Augustine and Philo of Alexandria, "thanks to which we can pass so easily above the abyss that separates Athens from Jerusalem," yet which paralyzes God's revealed truth. (ibid., p.303)

Over and over again Shestov returns to the deadly results of man's lust for knowledge which would submerge both God and man in its hostile Impersonalism. A learned man will not accept "the God of the Bible who rejoices, becomes angry, regrets what He has done, transforms water into wine, multiplies loaves of bread, leads the Jews across the Red Sea, etc. All this must be understood allegorically or metaphorically." (ibid., p.309) Nevertheless, "God returned to Job his flocks, his health, his children. God brought it about that *quod fuit non fuisse* (what had been had not been), without concerning Himself with any laws (of philosophy, like the "law of contradiction") whatsoever." (ibid.) In the world created by God, Shestov exclaims, "there are not and cannot be any first principles, that is, principles absolutely independent and sufficient by themselves." (ibid., p.314) Abraham simply believed God, needing no "proof" of reason, and his faith was counted to him for righteousness.

Was Shestov a Christian? Many passages in *Athens and Jerusalem* seem to affirm this because they call the New Testament God's word, and even refer to Jesus Christ as God. (See especially ibid., pp.322-323) On the other hand, there is no record of Shestov's formal conversion to Christianity or baptism, and during a lecture trip to Palestine in 1936 he was honored as "one of the great Jewish philosophers of the century." (ibid., p.26) While his philosophy contains crucial elements for a Christian epistemology free from the blandishments of autonomous reason, it relies too much on substantiation of the Christian faith by human expe-

rience. Shestov also neglects the role of biblical moral law and man's obedience thereto in faith. Not only the scholastics he rebukes but also Calvin whom he seems to endorse stood for man's obedience to God; Calvin said that "*omnis recta cognitio de obedientia nascitur* (all right knowledge is born of obedience)." For Shestov, however, man's freedom was all-important. This pre-occupation with freedom led him to the important insight that freedom to do only good prevailed in paradise. Such freedom, of course, is totally dependent upon man's perfect likeness to his perfectly good Creator; fallen man, and even the Christian believer in process of restoration to God- and Christlikeness, cannot have this freedom. Contrary to Shestov, not only distrust of God and a lust for knowledge but also disobedience of man was involved in the fall.

Shestov occasionally hints at but never completely states the truth that the biblical moral law is the expression of God's righteous character. If he did, then he might have concluded that the alleged conflict between God Himself and the law would turn out to be a strife about formulations. A fruitful line of inquiry for biblical Christian thought might be in what respects God's "created truths" agree or disagree with such principles as the law of contradiction, which Shestov simply rejects out of hand. Yes, God may rejoice, become angry, change His mind about destroying Nineveh and restore Job's flocks and children; but He is immutable in His righteous character (James 1:17) and "from age to age the same" (Hebrews 13:8 and Luther's "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God"). True, He can do all things, and nothing is impossible for Him in His creation; but "He cannot deny Himself" (II Timothy 2:13), abiding faithful and righteous for ever and ever. His character well agrees with the freedom to do only good man possessed in paradise and will again enjoy in eternity if redeemed in Christ; His character also agrees in its essential immutability with the law of contradiction, which therefore contrary to Shestov might turn out to be a "created truth," confirmed by the creation of fixed kinds according to Genesis 1. Miracles also confirm the "fixed" truth of biblical creation, even as any exception confirms a rule as the rule (the normally happening).

In a generation when the hegemony of godless autonomous reason appeared well-nigh irreversible (consider the hold Darwinism had upon the world), Shestov made a valiant attempt to uphold faith based on biblical creation. While extreme in his emphasis upon the "absurdity" of biblical faith, he was correct in attacking the *autonomy* of human reason exalting itself against the sovereign Creator, and in exposing the deadliness of its presumptions. He was certainly correct in demanding that everything man claims to "know" be tested against and can be validated only by the personal, sovereign God and Creator of the Bible and His revealed word.

References

¹ Lev Shestov, Athens and Jerusalem (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1986, p.13.

CREATION, THE FALL AND THE IDEA OF PROGRESS

Ellen Myers

Sociologist-historian Robert Nisbet's *History of the Idea of Progress*¹ is a monumental and informative book. However, it is fundamentally flawed when evaluated from the biblical Christian perspective because it overlooks biblical creation and man's fall.

Nisbet traces the idea of progress from the ancient Greeks to the middle of the twentieth century when the decline of Western civilization became an open secret and when confidence in science, its chief accomplishment, waned. Nisbet believes that only a renewal of religion or of a sense of the sacred can revive the idea of progress and with it the West. He hopes that such a revival is now under way, and believes that

the fusion of science and religion achieved by Teilhard de Chardin, one based upon the inexorable progress of human knowledge into the very distant future—and with this progress, the progress also of man's spirit and his estate on earth—will hold a very prominent place in it.²

This statement places Nisbet on the side of the worldwide New Age movement, which greatly venerates Teilhard de Chardin and promotes his cosmic evolutionist process philosophy. Nisbet shares the movement's optimism and emphasis upon "man's spirit." He believes that faith in progress is indispensable to actual progress, and also that belief in progress is intrinsic to Christianity.

Here is Nisbet's definition of the idea of progress:

Simply stated, the *idea of progress holds that mankind has advanced in the past—from some aboriginal condition of primitiveness, barbarism, or even nullity—is now advancing, and will continue to advance through the foreseeable future.* . . . The idea . . . must be thought a part of the very scheme of things in universe and society. Advance from the inferior to the superior must seem as real and certain as anything in the laws of nature.³

All this is akin to secular humanism and atheistic or pantheistic evolutionism, not to biblical Christianity.

Next, Nisbet asks what "advance" or "progress" means concretely, and replies that it means, first, "slow, gradual, and cumulative improvement in *knowledge*," and, second,

man's moral or spiritual condition on earth, his happiness, his freedom from torments of nature and society, and above all his serenity or tranquillity. The goal of progress or advancement is mankind's eventual

achievement, on *earth*, of these spiritual and moral virtues, thus leading toward ever-greater perfection of human nature.⁴

Thus defined, neither the idea of progress itself nor its concrete outworking can be reconciled with the biblical record of man's origin and destiny. According to Genesis 1 and 2 man was originally created perfect, in the image and likeness of God Himself, and "very good." From this condition man fell by disobeying God, and to this condition he can be restored not by himself but only by regeneration in Christ, initiated by God (John 1:12, 13).

Nisbet defines "knowledge" as "objective knowledge such as that in science and technology,"⁵ and his fleeting reference to the Fall omits the biblical fact that not "objective knowledge such as that in science and technology" but rather man's disobedience to God his Creator and Lord were at issue in Eden. A separate treatise could be written on whether man can acquire "objective" knowledge; Nisbet seems unaware of the crucial, tremendous problem of epistemology (the validation of how man "knows"). The implication of Nisbet's assumptions is certainly that man can bring about his own "progress" independent of God. Similarly Nisbet makes cavalierly short shrift of the Pelagian controversy in his discussion of St. Augustine as a Christian champion of the idea of progress. Pelagius held that man can reform himself and do good by himself virtually independent of God's grace and regeneration; this very opinion is also the gist of the idea of progress as defined by Nisbet; and this opinion was condemned by the Christian Church as a major heresy due largely to the efforts of Augustine.

Nisbet affirms that

corruptions of the idea of progress understood . . . I remain convinced that this idea has done more good over a twenty-five hundred-year period, led to more creativeness in more spheres, and given more strength to human hope and to individual desire for improvement than any other single idea in Western history.⁶

Nisbet maintains this defense of his idea of progress while admitting that "twentieth-century totalitarianism" and racism were founded on this idea of inexorable progress. The biblical teaching of the fall as *sin* is totally absent from his discussion, and therefore the necessity for man's regeneration in Christ is absent from his vision of mankind's eventual self-perfection "on *earth*." The Bible-believing Christian sees in modern totalitarianism and racism not temporary corruption of or slipping from a supposed norm of progress but rather a particularly vicious outburst of mankind's inherent fallenness from God's norm and God's law.

While in disagreement with Nisbet on this fundamental point, the Bible-believing Christian can agree that there has been progress in man's subduing or management of nature in, for example, agriculture, animal husbandry, medicine, transportation and housing. These endeavors are part and parcel of man's original creation mandate over the earth received from God the Cre-

ator (Genesis 1:26, 28). Since man is affected by sin, so is his exercise of his dominion mandate, resulting in much suffering by the rest of creation (Romans 8:22). Nevertheless plagues like polio and smallpox have been eradicated, waste and marginal lands have been opened for production, infant mortality has been reduced, and so on.

Another "upward" development may be found in the arts and humanities. "Progress" here is, for instance, the difference between simple folk tunes and the polyphonal compositions of Bach, or between a child's stick figure drawings to the paintings of Rembrandt (Bach and Rembrandt were Christians). However, modern art and music in their headlong surrender to sheer abstraction cannot be understood as an organic upward development from earlier artistic achievements. On the contrary, they testify that humanistic optimism and its strictly this-worldly idea of "progress" is now, as Nisbet himself sadly concedes, "at bay." As Jesus Christ told us, we must first seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these other things shall be added to us (Matthew 6:25-34). The most important progress in the world has been the preaching of the Gospel and its results among converted peoples and individuals. For example, when Kievan Rus (precursor of modern Russia) was brought to Christ in 988 A.D., the rapid changes from barbarism to beauty and order were astounding. Kiev soon abounded with churches, hospitals and schools as the fame of its advanced civilization spread abroad. Modern science and mathematics developed only in the Christian West. It is not "the idea of progress" which is at the root of actual progress, but rather regeneration in Christ and the active out-working of biblical faith in all areas of human action.

Since Nisbet omits the biblical doctrine of man's original sinless creation and his fall into sin, and hence misreads man's history as man's progress from aboriginal barbarism as compatible with Christianity (or at least with the thought of St. Augustine), it is not surprising that he emphasizes the influence of millenarian thought in Christian circles upon later humanistic philosophies of progress:

Through the fertile mixture of pre- and post-Christian Jewish millenarian thought and Greek metaphysical and scientific ideas, Christianity had a well-developed millennialist doctrine by the second century, one that presented a picture of a future earthly paradise in the richest colors, or a heaven come down to the earth. No other element of Christian thought has had as profound and far-reaching effect upon the entire world, not merely the West . . . We should be hard put to account for the social utopias of the Saint-Simonians, Comtists, and especially the Marxists . . . were there not a long and powerful tradition of Christian millennialist utopianism which could be, in some degree, secularized, with its apocalyptic intensity left undiminished.⁷

Nisbet does not say whether this second-century Christian

millennialism taught that the millennium would come before or after the Second Coming of Christ, a question dividing Christian believers today. When discussing the seventeenth-century English Puritans, Nisbet points to their post-millennialism (Christ returns *after* the earthly millennium) which, he asserts, combined progress in the arts and sciences as "at once a *sign* of the imminence of the golden age of the spirit on earth and a *cause* of this imminence."⁸ Nisbet claims that the "religiously-intoxicated minds" in England and New England were enticed by their faith in the arts and sciences into a view of God "as a kind of *process*." Progress became a pattern, a "natural law," and God no longer was, He Himself "progressed" or "unfolded."⁹ Nisbet ascribes the rise of deism or even of "let(ting) God slip away entirely" in the next century to Puritan postmillennial thought. There is just one thing wrong with this analysis: Nisbet entirely omits the Puritans' proverbial stress upon man's submission to God's commandments as given in the Bible. Obedience to God's law at least as much as pursuit of scientific research was the Puritans' indispensable condition for establishing God's kingdom on earth. They also preached the absolute necessity of man's regeneration by God's sovereign grace which must precede his "good works" and alone enables him to perform them, even as Augustine had maintained against Pelagius.

According to Nisbet, mainline Puritans saw the millennium as a "stage, the final earthly stage, of human progress. Evolution, not revolution, is the essence. And this too is a prime ingredient of nineteenth-century theories of progress, along with the spirit of reform and utilitarian emphasis upon the material happiness of mankind."¹⁰ However, there also was an "other, explosive, no less Puritan type of mind that sees the millennium as . . . an end requiring for its complete success violence, war, and even terror."¹¹ Nisbet associates this view with the Fifth Monarchy movement under Oliver Cromwell, which saw itself at the threshold of the millennium. Nisbet comments that "Precisely the same spirit, albeit somewhat more secularized, would animate the leaders of the French and then the Russian Revolutions."¹² The French and Russian Revolutions, of course, in no way promoted but rather destroyed progress.

Over against historians who would make a sharp difference between adherents of progress by slow, cumulative change and believers in progress by revolution and raw power, Nisbet argues that

this is too restricted and artificial a conception of the idea of progress. What the idea means . . . is first and foremost that humanity is advancing toward some goal continuously, inexorably, and necessarily. Such an idea is . . . indispensable . . . to the chilastic mind bent upon sudden transformation through whatever means, as it is to a Turgot, Mill, or Spencer. From the post-medieval disciples of Joachim, eager to hasten through sword and torch . . . the arrival of the millen-

nium, through the zealots of the Puritan Revolution, through the Jacobins in the French Revolution, down to the Lenins, Stalins, Hitlers, and Maos of the twentieth century, the most awful of persecutions, tortures, massacres, and sieges of terror have had for their justification a sense of historical development, of necessary historical development, every bit as galvanizing as any Crusader's sense of God needing to be avenged against the infidel.¹³

Nisbet's blanket endorsement of the idea of progress, and indeed the very idea of progress itself, is questionable when appalling atrocities are condoned in its name. The Bible-believing Christian can never agree that the end justifies the means, or that we may do evil that good may come (Romans 3:8).

Nisbet believes that the discovery of the New World "strengthened the Christian providentialist interpretation of history as a progressive movement which would culminate in the evangelization of all mankind."¹⁴ Gradually, Nisbet states, the Christian stress upon the rule of God in history subtly changed to the rule of "Providence" and finally was omitted altogether. Nisbet traces this development brilliantly through summaries of the thought of great European thinkers including Bossuet, Leibniz and Vico. With Vico, Nisbet says, the post-Christian, modern idea of progress as belief in *science* came upon the horizon. In the nineteenth century this idea was captured most prominently in Darwin's *Origin of Species*, from which Nisbet quotes the following:

(W)e may feel certain that the ordinary succession by generation has never once been broken, and that no cataclysm has desolated the world. Hence we may look with some confidence to a secure future of great length. And as natural selection works solely by and for the good of each being, all corporeal and mental endowments will tend to progress toward perfection.¹⁵

Of course Darwin's optimistic progressivism was thoroughly anti-biblical in its denial of the Flood and of the final judgment. (Where, by the way, can the biblical final judgment find a place in Nisbet's "idea of progress"?) Speaking strictly scientifically, Darwin's belief in evolution by small, gradual increments has now been thoroughly discredited by many contrary findings, especially the absence of intermediate forms in the fossil record. This fact has given rise to the modern evolution model which allows "cataclysms" in the past and proceeds by big leaps ("punctuated equilibrium"). Again speaking scientifically, the entire idea of upward evolution from simple cell to complex organism is now, in Michael Denton's words, a "theory in crisis" in view of the astounding complexity of the individual cell revealed by modern microbiology.¹⁶

Nisbet cites Darwin's reference to the Creator at the end of the *Origin* "to show that even Darwin could combine at least the rudiments of what had once been an all-out faith in Christianity with progressivism" and that "innumerable professed Christians . . . could find so much in Darwin's historic work to agree with and to

find compatible with views already arrived at."¹⁷ Nisbet, Darwin and "professed Christians" notwithstanding, evolutionary progressivism is a fantasy without foundation in created reality.

Nisbet discusses the idea of progress defined as ever increasing individual freedom as proposed by Turgot, Adam Smith, Malthus, Kant, John Stuart Mill, and Herbert Spencer, as well as the American Founding Fathers.¹⁸ Many of these men seem to have shared a naive and unbiblical trust in the natural goodness of human nature. Adam Smith considered "the natural effort of every individual to better his own condition" the mainspring of human progress. Phillip Freneau celebrated the American Revolution by predicting that "All men will rise from what they are;/Sublimed and superior, far,/Than Solon guessed, or Plato saw;/All will be just, all will be good—/That harmony, 'not understood,'/Will reign the general law."¹⁹ They believed that if the individual is free to exercise his will and talents (provided no one else's liberty is violated), mankind's progress is assured. The Bible-believing Christian must insist that man's freedom be exercised under God and within God's law, or freedom turns to license and leads to misery, not progress. Furthermore, man after the Fall is not naturally good but a sinner by nature, and the effects of sin mark even the regenerate. Of all this Nisbet says nothing, emphasizing rather the opposition of the defenders of progress defined as "freedom" against the shackles of government. In our day of mushrooming government expansion we can sympathize with this position, yet we must stick to our biblical reservations as noted.

Nisbet deals with various nineteenth-century utopian movements viewing progress as the exercise of power. Here is much information on Rousseau, Fichte, Hegel, Saint-Simon, Comte, Marx, and Gobineau (the father of modern racism in Europe), among others. For them, freedom is inseparable from some kind of community or collective in which an elite exercises all power, yet where paradoxically the ideal for mankind is equality. Nothing less than a transformation of human nature by way of the reconstitution of society is their goal. This radical renewal of mankind is to be implemented in a rigorously scientific manner. Some allowed a role for something like religious worship in their programs, with mankind itself the object of veneration. Thus Auguste Comte wrote that his positivism was "Christianity denatured of its superstitions and converted into worship of the Grand Being, which is society or humanity."²⁰ Much as Nisbet seeks to undergird his concept of the continuity of the idea of progress over time by recurrent references to the thought of St. Augustine as somehow congenial to modern progressives, by this time the incompatibility between Christianity and Nisbet's secular idea of progress is quite clear. Creation and the Fall cannot be spliced together with the supposedly inexorable rise of man from barbarism to perfection by his own efforts.

Nisbet considers the idea of progress as power, especially in its Marxist and racist forms, as a corruption of the idea of progress as such. In view of his earlier inclusion of progress by "sudden transformation through whatever means" as legitimate within the over-

all Idea of progress, however, he cannot now consistently call progress viewed as power a corruption of the overall Idea of progress. In Comte, Marx, Hitler, Lenin, Stalin and Mao we see the end result of the idea of progress of man without God. God was left out of the concept to begin with, and He the Creator and Sustainer of all things will not share His glory with Idols made by apostate, sinful, unregenerate, proud man. Nisbet notwithstanding, the idea of progress, omitting Creator, Fall and regeneration in Christ, is not "noble"²¹ but fatally flawed and doomed to failure.

References

- ¹ Robert Nisbet, *History of the Idea of Progress* (New York: Basic Books, 1980).
- ² Ibid., p. 316.
- ³ Ibid., pp. 4, 5.
- ⁴ Ibid., p. 5, emphasis in original
- ⁵ Ibid., p. 8.
- ⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷ Ibid., p. 68.
- ⁸ Ibid., p. 127.
- ⁹ Ibid., p. 129.
- ¹⁰ Ibid., p. 130.
- ¹¹ Ibid., p. 135.
- ¹² Ibid., p. 137.
- ¹³ Ibid., p. 139.
- ¹⁴ Statement by J. H. Elliott, quoted ibid., p. 147.
- ¹⁵ Quoted ibid., p. 175.
- ¹⁶ See Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Bethesda, MD: Adler & Adler, 1986).
- ¹⁷ Ibid., p. 176.
- ¹⁸ Nisbet is wrong about the American Founding Fathers. For a definitive study of the decisive influence of Christianity and the biblical doctrine of creation on the origin of political liberty and the making of the United States, see Gary Amos, *Defending the Declaration (of Independence)* (Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth & Hyatt, 1989)
- ¹⁹ Ibid., p. 202.
- ²⁰ Quoted ibid., p. 257
- ²¹ Ibid., p. 296.

1291 - 1991

BURIAL OF SEVEN CENTURIES OF SWISS CHRISTIAN HISTORY

Pauline Pretre

According to the Geneva literary critic Jean Starobinski, the Federal Pact, "In the name of Almighty God" ... and the Great Prayer of the Confederates spoken at every mortal interior or exterior combat, are the Christian heritage of this country whose Federal flag is nothing but the Cross of the Living Christ.

The founders of our country did not allow themselves to be deceived by the sinful, bestial tendencies of fallen human nature. This is the somber witness agreeing with Holy Scripture as well as human history. Nourished by the firm will to resist this inclination to evil, our fathers appealed to God, trusting in His help for the accomplishment of their heavy duties as men and citizens.

As the cradle of the Reformation in the sixteenth century Switzerland knew how to keep alive the flame of a Christian faith which brought its beneficial influence even into the country's political system. But with the massive adoption of the vision of a Welfare State in 1948 our fellow citizens traded the sovereignty of a merciful and just God for the sovereignty of the universal Surveillance of a State with all powerful claims. In their blindness induced by the adoption of a rational, liberal and neo-orthodox theology, and the rejection of the infallible inspiration and divine authority of the Bible, the churches embraced such a spiritual and political disaster with relief. From now on the churches and the Christians of our country would no longer have to alleviate the social miseries in any way. By this spiritual default a breach was opened in the intellectual and moral life of our country. Thus the socialist and Marxist ideology could penetrate our universities and higher schools without resistance. It is thus that the disciplines of the spirit, and especially all the social and human sciences, were corrupted in our country by the default of the churches and their leaders. Under the cover of politics apparently dominated by conservative and Christian democratic tendencies the Christian foundations of our Confederation were undermined.

Already in the 1960's it was obligatory for admission to certain social and pedagogical schools in our country to fill out forms of several pages where the students had to express their convictions regarding the state, religion, society, psychology and many other topics. Such questionnaires became equally obligatory in the normal schools training the future teachers. In numerous public institutions the young people were thus forced to submit to a new social-Marxist conformism as a condition of their professional train-

ing. Thus a society which had been free and responsible before the omniscient and omnipresent God of the Bible, Who had been the God of our country until then, submitted little by little to an ideological and political consensus which was nothing less than the abrogation of the faith of our ancestors and of our highest traditions. Thus disappear the liberties of a country: personal liberty, liberty of speech, liberty of instruction.

In 1990 giant steps were taken on the road to the complete dechristianization of our country. One of our most Catholic cantons suppressed the formula, "In the Name of God on High," which had given a transcendental authority until then to any decision by a lawyer or notary. In another canton, one of the most Protestant ones, the department of public instruction and religion forbade the free distribution of New Testaments in the secondary schools of the state. This series of anti-Christian outbursts was loosed in a Tessin village school by a free-thinking teacher who filed judicial action for the removal of crucifixes still decorating the schools. Having to pronounce on this case, the Federal Court declared the presence of the crucifix in public schools anticonstitutional.

But this is not all. Since the introduction of the New Right of Childhood on January 1, 1978, children and adolescents have the right to denounce their parents before the judicial authorities for any reason whatsoever, because "every child must have someone to flee to from his own parents." In such a situation, once the child has fallen into the hands of the social and judicial authorities, the parents have no further rights whatever. The will of the child is as it were made equal to the will of God. No matter how perverted that will may be—and very often the social authorities undertake to encourage the vices of the young!—is so to speak identified with the will of God, and this to the harm of any truly Christian education. According to the Freudian and Marxist dictates which predominate in these social services, Christian education is judged repressive and unilateral, and therefore harmful to youth. In the administrative rules regulating the action of these social, psychiatric and educational services of the state, no article exists upon which the parents could base a defense of their own rights. The Federal Constitution does, however, expressly guarantee this right of the parents to their liberty of faith, expression, education and thought. Yet no article gives the parents the right to be heard before any administrative decision intruding into the intimate life of the family. Woe to the families who fall into the hands of the social services (severing agencies?) of our country. A permissive, secular and hedonistic jurisprudence crowns the injustices the parents, and this applies especially to those who are the most exposed and most vulnerable among them, must suffer without respite and without mercy. This impartial and moderate judgment of most of the social services of our country is sometimes shared (and even expressed to the public) by the police services themselves which very often must pick up the broken pieces of such permissive impunity.

The totalitarian harrow of the Swiss social state is manifested with an unheard-of offense by the introduction of the new Family Law of January 1, 1988. This legislation does not consider the husband as the head of the family. Consequently he is no longer under obligation to provide materially for the entire support of his family and his children. The state, in the person of the judge, is made head of the family upon the least dissension among the couple. The wife, who generally makes 25% less than her husband, is forced by this unjust legislation to contribute 50% of the cost of the household. The controlling state, the Welfare State (French: "l'Etat Providence"), thus puts itself in the place of the merciful Heavenly Father Who, in His wisdom, had appointed the father the head of the family. This pitiless and meddling state is now standing at the door of every family. From now on no home is safe from its social and judicial police ready to intervene at the smallest trifle. All that is needed for this is a neighbor (or absent parent) of evil intention or ill will, who sees himself in the role of the Savior of the poor mistreated children. A simple telephone call is enough to conjure up the henchmen of social justice. Children are incited to denounce their parents, because the modern scapegoats are called Papa and Mama. This is what the telephone SOS-Childhood reminds us of every day. Denunciation of one's parents must become a social virtue just as under Communism. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are here by the will of the people. The Romans said it well: *vox populi, vox dei!* The voice of the people is the voice of god.

This Switzerland was once considered by our neighbors, less fortunate than we, almost as paradise on earth. Peace reigned here thanks to numberless men and women whose courageous and upright faith was not afraid to put God's commandments into practice. She is called today to repent, to turn back toward her God who has not ceased to bless our country for seven hundred years. Only a return to the cross of Christ, to this cross whose emblem honors our flag so highly, can again make the river flow over our land which purifies and restores the grace of God. May our God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, respond to the entreaties of His people and grant them the fruits of a sincere repentance.

Editor's Note: This eye-opening article on contemporary Switzerland first appeared in the excellent Christian monthly review, *Resister et Construire*, No. 16-17, September 1991. To subscribe to *Resister et Construire*, write to: Case postale 468, CH-1001 Lausanne, Suisse. Translated by Ellen Myers and reprinted with permission.

SHARING IN CHRIST'S SUFFERINGS AND GLORY: THE CHURCH'S CALLING BEFORE CHRIST'S RETURN

Richard B. Gaffin, Jr.

Over the interadvental period in its entirety, from beginning to end, a fundamental aspect of the church's existence is (to be) "suffering with Christ"; nothing, the New Testament teaches, is more basic to its identity than that.

Two passages, both in Paul, are especially instructive concerning this reality. Strictly speaking, they are autobiographical, but the immediate and broader context of both shows that they intend to provide a paradigm, not only for other apostles or his own generation but for all believers until Jesus comes.

2 Corinthians 4:7—"But we have this treasure in jars of clay to show that this all-surpassing power is from God and not from us."

"This treasure in jars of clay" graphically captures the tension at the heart of this statement and of the apostle's overall understanding of the nature of Christian existence between the resurrection and the return of Christ. "This treasure" is the Gospel or, better, the content of the Gospel—the glory-light of the (exalted) Christ (v. 4), the eschatological, new-creation glory of God, revealed in Christ (v. 6). "Clay jars," in contrast, are believers—in all of their mortality and fragility. We have "this treasure," Paul says, but for now, until Jesus comes, we have it only in the "clay jars" that we are. Or, as he puts it elsewhere (Romans 6:12-13), believers are "alive from the dead," already resurrected, but they are that only "in the mortal body," as they are (in that sense) still unresurrected.

Verses 8 and 9 expand on this fundamental, resurrected/not-resurrected "dialectic" of the Christian life—by means of four pairs of pointedly formulated contrasts: as "clay jars," believers are "hard pressed on every side," "perplexed," "persecuted," and "struck down"; nevertheless (note the fourfold repetition of "but not")—as possessing "this treasure"—they are "not crushed," "not in despair," "not abandoned," and "not destroyed."

Verse 10 further describes this reality in summary fashion: we (believers) carry around in the body "the dying of Jesus" (*nekrosis* here has in view death as an activity or process) so that "the life of Jesus ("this treasure") may be manifested "in our body" ("in clay jars"). Verse 11 closely parallels verse 10 with slight explanatory variations: "always being given over to death for Jesus' sake, so that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh."

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XIV, No. 3 (Spring 1992)

Even from this brief analysis of the passage there should be little difficulty in recognizing that in the summary description in verses 10-11 suffering (characterized as "the dying of Jesus" and "always being given over to death for Jesus' sake") and "the life of Jesus" are not separate sectors of Christian experience, as if the latter, by addition, somehow balances off and compensates for the former. Rather, Paul intends to say, as long as believers are in "the mortal body," "the life of Jesus" manifests itself as "the dying of Jesus"; the latter describes the existence mode of the former. Until the resurrection of the body at his return Christ's resurrection-life finds expression in the church's sufferings (and, as will become clear presently, nowhere else—so far as the existence and calling of the church are concerned); the locus of Christ's ascension-power is the suffering church.

This, it should not be overlooked, involves an evangelistic or missiological reality of fundamental proportions—"death is at work in us, but life is at work in you" (v. 12; cf. v. 7) "that this all-surpassing power may from God and not from us".

Philippians 3:10—"I want to know Christ and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of sharing in his sufferings, becoming like him in his death."

This aspiration expresses essentially the same idea as 2 Corinthians 4:10-11. In the immediate context Paul is concerned for "the surpassing greatness of knowing Christ Jesus (his) Lord" (v. 8), knowledge that comes from being "found in him" (v. 9), that is, from being united with Christ. Verse 10, then, brings into view a fundamental component of this rich, experiential union-knowledge.

A key to the intended impact of verse 10 is to recognize that both "ands" (following "Christ" and "resurrection") are not simply coordinating but explanatory; they do not merely connect, they explicate. In step-wise fashion Paul progressively traces a single, composite notion: Knowing the power of his resurrection is not something in addition to knowing Christ, nor is knowing the fellowship of his sufferings a further addition to both. Rather, the controlling consideration is union with Christ in his death and resurrection such that to "know"/experience Christ is to experience the power of his resurrection and that, in turn, is to experience the fellowship of his sufferings—a total reality that can then be summed up as conformity to Christ's death.

By virtue of union with Christ, Paul is saying, the power of Christ's resurrection is realized in the sufferings of the believer; sharing in Christ's sufferings is the way the church manifests his resurrection-power. Again, as in 2 Corinthians 4:10-11, the locus of eschatological life is Christian suffering; the mark—the indelible, ineradicable impression—left on the existence of the church by the formative power of the resurrection is the *Cross*. And, further, this is not some merely temporary state of affairs incidental to the circumstances of the church in the apostle's own day but is for all—the whole church in whatever time and place—who aspire to the resurrection of the dead (v. 11).

This is also what Romans 8:17b has in view when Paul rounds off his immediately preceding teaching with a sweeping proviso—not a condition for the adoption just spoken of (v. 14b-17a) but a conditional element nonetheless, given with that adoption: “if indeed we share his (Christ’s) sufferings in order that we may also share in his glory.”

This correlation of future glory and present suffering is a prominent concern in the section that follows. At least two points are worth noting about “our sufferings” (v. 18): (1) their nature/breadth and (2) their terminus.

Christian suffering ought not to be conceived of too narrowly. In the passages so far considered, and elsewhere in the New Testament (e.g., 2 Corinthians 1:5-10 and 1 Peter 4:12-19), suffering surely includes but is more than persecution and martyrdom (reserved primarily, say, for apostles and foreign missionaries).

Romans 8:18ff. especially discloses the breadth of what ought to be our conception of Christian suffering. Suffering has to be seen in the context of the “frustration”/futility (*mataiotes*), the “bondage to decay” to which the entire creation has been subjected, not by the inherent nature of things but because of God’s curse on Adam’s sin (v. 20-21 are, in effect, a Pauline commentary on Genesis 3). Suffering is a function of the futility/decay principle pervasively at work in the creation since the fall; suffering is everything that pertains to creaturely experience of this death-principle.

From this perspective, then, Christian suffering is literally all the ways in which this “weakness-existence” (v. 26) is borne, by faith, in the service of Christ—the mundane, “trivial” but often so easily exasperating and unsettling frustrations of daily living, as well as monumental testing and glaring persecution. Suffering with Christ is the totality of existence “in the mortal body” and within “this world in its present form (that) is passing away” (1 Corinthians 7:31), endured for his sake. What has to be reckoned with here is the pervasive “givenness” of Christian suffering—its constitutive nature for the existence of the church as a whole; suffering for Christ is the inseparable correlate of believing in him—the precise point of Philippians 1:29: “For it has been granted to you on behalf of Christ not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for him ...” (cf. 2 Timothy 3:12: “In fact (“in the last days,” v. 1, that is, until his return), everyone who wants to live a godly life in Christ Jesus will be persecuted).”

Romans 8:18ff. is no less clear as to the terminus of this comprehensive suffering. Together with the rest of the creation, Satan and his servants excepted, believers exist in hope (v. 20), in “groaning” (v. 22-23, cf. 26) anticipation (v. 29, 23) of “the revelation of the sons of God” (v. 19), of “the glorious freedom of the children of God” (v. 21). This revelation/liberation of believers (note: along with and inseparable from the liberation of creation as a whole) is the future dimension of their adoption and will take place at the time of the redemption (= resurrection) of the body (v. 23), not before. Until then, at Christ’s return, the suffering/futil-

ity/decay principle in creation remains in force, undiminished (but sure to be overcome); it is an enervating factor that cuts across the church's existence, including its mission, in its entirety. The notion that this frustration factor will be demonstrably reduced, and the church's suffering service noticeably alleviated and even compensated, in a future era before Christ's return is not merely foreign to this passage; it trivializes as well as blurs both the present suffering and future hope/glory in view. Until his return, the church remains one step behind its exalted Lord; his exaltation means its (privileged) humiliation, his return (and not before), its exaltation.

It bears emphasizing that what we are presently considering is not some subordinate, peripheral strand of New Testament teaching. That can be further appreciated from the fundamental structural observation that Paul and the other writers expound the teaching of Jesus and so the eschatological reality, central to that teaching according to the Synoptic Gospels, called the kingdom of God/heaven; the New Testament writers are basically interpreters of the kingdom-proclamation of Jesus (and, so, in turn, of the Old Testament as the roots of that proclamation).

The passages on suffering just considered, among others, expand on a fundamental dimension of Jesus' teaching on discipleship: the actual arrival of the eschatological kingdom in Jesus' coming means, until his return, suffering service. In the kingdom the measure of greatness is to be a servant (Matthew 20:26; Mark 10:43); a key watchword of the kingdom is "very last and servant of all" (Mark 9:35). More specifically, Jesus announces as an absolute requisite, "life-saving" condition of discipleship: "If anyone would come after me, he must deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow me (Luke 9:23-24; cf. Matthew 10:38; 16:24; Mark 8:34; Luke 14:27). Cross bearing is a comprehensive description of kingdom-discipleship, as the qualification "daily" makes explicit. In response to the disciples' request for prominent kingdom status—kingdom "dominion," if you will—the only promise Jesus has for them (and us), this side of his return, is the "fellowship of sharing in his sufferings" (cf. Philippians 3:10): "You will drink the cup I drink and be baptized with the baptism I am baptized with" (Mark 10:37, 39). John has got it just right: until Jesus comes again, the presence of the kingdom is bracketed by the realities of "suffering" and "endurance" (Revelation 1:9; cf. 3:11, 22:7, 12, 20).

This mark—this *essential* mark—of the church's identity seems muted or largely ignored today. Most assuredly, the eschatology of the New Testament is an "eschatology of victory"—victory presently being realized by and for the church, through the eschatological kingship of the exalted Christ (Ephesians 1:22). But any outlook that fails to grasp that, short of Christ's return, this eschatology of victory is an eschatology of suffering—an eschatology of (Christ's) "power made perfect in weakness" (2 Corinthians 12:9)—confuses the identity of the church. As Paul reminds the church just a few verses after the Romans 8 passage considered above (v. 37), *not* "beyond" or "(only) after" but *in all these things* ("trouble or hardship or persecution or famine or na-

kedness or danger or sword," v. 35), "we are more than conquerors." Until Jesus comes again, the church "wins" by "losing."

Any outlook that tends to remove or obscure the (constitutive) dimension of suffering for the Gospel from the present *triumph* of the church is an illusion. According to Jesus, the church will not have drained the shared cup of his suffering until he returns. The church cannot afford to evade that point. It does so at the risk of jeopardizing its own identity. The perennially demanding, often perplexing path the church is called to follow, until Jesus comes, can be negotiated only as "we live by faith, not by sight" (2 Corinthians 5:7).

Editor's Note: Excerpted and reprinted from the author's chapter "Theonomy and Eschatology" in *Theonomy: A Reformed Critique* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990), pp. 196-224 with permission of the author.

BOOK REVIEWS

Judith A. Reisman and Edward W. Eichel, Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: The Indoctrination Of A People.

Lafayette, LA: Huntington House Publishers, 1990. Hardcover,
234 pp., Bibliography and Index, est. price \$12. ppd.

Order from: Huntington House Publishers,
P.O.Box 53788, Lafayette, LA 70505.

The world-famous report by Dr. Alfred Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, was first published in 1948. It initiated the sexual revolution in the West by purporting to show that (1) no sexual behaviors are abnormal or perverted, and (2) sexuality begins in earliest babyhood. It was clothed in the garb of scientific research at a time when public confidence in scientists was very high. To this day sex research and textbooks rely upon the Kinsey Report as if it were the whole truth and nothing but the truth about human sexuality.

The book begins with a dedication to "the several hundred children who suffered inhumanely in the illegal sex experiments that constitute the basis for a significant portion of Dr. Alfred Kinsey's book *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*" and "to those children who are being subjected to the kind of Kinseyan sex education curricula described in this book." The main author, Dr. Judith A. Reisman, is the president of the Institute for Media Education and has been a consultant for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The co-author, Edward W. Eichel, is currently a psychotherapist in New York City and has researched and published widely in the field of sexual compatibility. Dr. Reisman presented a paper on Kinsey's fraudulent child sexuality data already in 1981 at the Fifth World Congress of Sexology in Jerusalem, in which she called for an investigation of the work of the Kinsey team. When the academic community disregarded her request, the present book became necessary. Dr. Reisman's also did research on child sex abuse in *Playboy*, *Penthouse* and *Hustler* magazines for the U. S. Department of Justice. Her research was used in U. S. Supreme Court cases dealing with child pornography.

Kinsey, Sex and Fraud shows conclusively that the Kinsey research was flawed, chiefly by using people biased toward unconventional sexual behavior. The late famous psychologist Dr. Abraham Maslow warned Kinsey about the probability of bias in the personality type and sexual behavior of his volunteers already in 1942. The facts proved Dr. Maslow correct and hence, as Maslow wrote to a colleague in 1970, "the whole basis for Kinsey's

statistics was proven to be shaky." Kinsey responded by excluding all Dr. Maslow's work from his bibliography, hardly the reaction of an honest researcher.

Kinsey's child sex experiment data were apparently obtained without parental and certainly without "informed" consent of the infants or children involved. It is highly questionable whether they "enjoyed" what was done to them, as shown by a passage on their responses to adult-induced orgasm from the Kinsey Report itself (p. 51). Information was also obtained from convicted sex criminals in penitentiaries, which weighed the Kinsey results in favor of the prevalence of unconventional sex among men. Similar twisting of the evidence characterizes all Kinsey's research.

Of course the truth will out sooner or later. With regard to homosexuality among men, greatly exaggerated forecasts about the incidence of AIDS were made for New York City based on Kinsey research data. According to these data, the gay population of New York City had been estimated at 500,000 (among the total 7.2 million residents). However, in July 1988 the figures were revised sharply downward to only 100,000, an eighty percent drop; therefore, the estimated number of AIDS-infected gay men in New York City also dropped from 200-250,000 to 50,000 (p.178-9). The Kinsey Report had estimated that one out of ten males between 16 and 55 in the general population was gay. For the nation as a whole, figures have also had to be scaled downward, from 1.5 million AIDS-infected Americans to 1 million or perhaps only 650,000. The Kinsey data were doubtless inflated not only due to faulty sam-pling of subjects, but also due to the error of using the accumulative incidence technique (counting subjects more than once).

This book ought to be read, of course, by anyone involved in sex education, psychology and psychiatry. It is also a great eye opener for the general public. It confirms the Bible-believing Christian's view that there is normal sex sanctioned by God our Creator Who made us male and female in the beginning, and Who ordained biblical marriage and the biblical family. It will help Christians in the front lines of the battle against the prevalent amoral sex education in public schools by showing how fraudulent the "scientific" basis of such sex education really is.

—Reviewed by Ellen Myers

Gerard J. Keane, *Creation Rediscovered*.

Australia: Credis Pty Ltd, P.O. Box 451, Doncaster Vic 3108, 1991.

In USA, order from: STELLA MARIS BOOKS, P.O.Box 11483, Ft. Worth, TX 76110-1483 \$13.75 plus postage, 1-800-772-5928.

Softcover, 302 pp. Foreword by Prof. Maciej Giertych, Appendix, Index.

The modern creation movement is certainly viable and expanding, as proven by the continuing appearance of books like *Creation Rediscovered* which add refreshing new perspectives to the creation issue. Gerard J. Keane is a well-read Australian Catholic lay person who has materials from a variety of Christian and non-Christian sources in order to show that "the concept of special creation provides a far better explanation of the data than evolution theory"; the harmful effects of evolution theory upon mankind and Christianity; and, finally, to elicit renewed attention to the origins issue from the teaching Magisterium of the Catholic Church. While the author naturally writes first of all for fellow Catholic Christians, *Creation Rediscovered* does not deal with the theological issues separating Catholics from Protestant Christians.

By no means skip the excellent Foreword by Professor Maciej Giertych, Head of Genetics Department of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Dendrology at Kornik, Poland. Professor Giertych begins by recalling an aged speaker against evolution he laughingly rejected with all his fellow students at Oxford University in 1955. However, Giertych adds, "Today his views are being vindicated by new evidence from natural sciences." Later, as his children studied evolution in school, he realized that population genetics, his own field, had now become the chief "evidence" for evolution, because much of earlier "evidence" had had to be discarded. However, genetics does not furnish evidence for evolution either:

The closer one looks at the evidence for evolution the less one finds of substance. In fact the theory keeps on postulating evidence, and failing to find it, moves on to other postulates (fossil missing-links, natural selection of improved forms, positive mutations, molecular phylogenetic sequences etc.). This is not science. A whole age of scientific endeavour was wasted searching for a phantom. It is time we stopped and looked for facts. Natural sciences failed to supply any evidence for evolution. Christian philosophy tried to accommodate this unproven postulate of materialist philosophies. Much time and intellectual effort went in vain leading only to negative moral consequences. It is time those working in the humanities were told the truth. (p.4)

Keane covers much of the ground explored by earlier creationist writers, such as evolution theories, the fossil record, entropy, the age of the world, the influence of evolution on mankind

through Nazism, Communism and Humanism, and within Christendom. His style is clear and concise, and his discussion of scientific matters is easily accessible to any educated lay person. His copious footnotes show that he has done his homework well.

Besides presenting basic scientific evidences for creation already well-known to seasoned creationists, Keane enlivens his account by fresh reflections as well as using data not encountered in other creation literature. For example, when discussing information data and intelligence, he writes: "If radio signals were to be received from outer space they would be regarded as evidence of an intelligent source. Therefore, the message sequence on the DNA molecule should be regarded as *prima facie* evidence of an intelligent source" (p. 14). When discussing the geological column, he cites evolutionist geologist Edmund Speker (1956) that "The followers of the founding fathers (of evolutionist geology) went forth across the Earth and in Procrustean fashion made it fit the sections they found, even in places where the actual evidence literally proclaimed denial. So flexible and accommodating are the 'facts' of geology" (p. 21). Keane also refers to the recent (1990) experiments on sedimentology carried out at the State University of Colorado by French geologist Guy Berthault.

A wonderful argument against Neo-Darwinism from the two ducts (*foramen ovale* and *ductus arteriosus* existing in or near the heart of the human fetus is outlined in detail (pp. 27-29) and deserves wide dissemination among creationists, especially our young people in school and college. There is an excellent summary of the genetic differences between chimpanzees and man by world-famous French geneticist Jerome Lejeune: "In other words, between the two species the genetic vocabulary is common, except for less than 1% variations, whereas the structure of the chromosomes is notably different ... It all seems to happen as if the genetic instructions being almost identical, the order in which they are expressed makes all the difference" (pp. 108-109).

The book is completed by sections on the senses of Scripture, on the influence of evolution on belief systems including Christianity, the problem of evil, and existentialism. In the concluding section, "Creation Rediscovered," the author rightly states that "the present diminution in Christian conviction has come about primarily because the true story of creation, especially the section dealing with Original Sin, has been largely 'lost' and the notion of God the Creator in effect has been downgraded. In its place has come ... the weird notion of God the Evolutor" (p. 285).

The brief appendix sums up the ruling of the Pontifical Biblical Commission on the historical character of the first three chapters of Genesis issued in 1909. All present-day biblical creationists could subscribe to all parts of this Catholic ruling, except that Protestant biblical creationists believe that the Hebrew word *yom* (day) in the first chapters of Genesis must be taken to mean a literal 24-hour day, whereas the Pontifical Biblical Commission of 1909 permits the meaning of *yom* as "a certain space of time."

This is an excellent introduction to the creation/origins issue

with fresh new insights and information of value to all Bible-believing Christians. Highly recommended.

—Reviewed by Ellen Myers

James Nickel, Mathematics: Is God Silent?

Ross House Books, P. O. Box 67, Vallecito, CA, 1990.
Hardcover, 126 pp., \$20. ppd.

This unique book deals with the meaning of mathematics on the basis of biblical creation. Backed by years of research and experience as a Christian mathematics teacher, the author shows that God is not silent in mathematics. On the contrary, the fit of mathematics to the real universe shows the marvelous order and beauty, the *design* of the world in which we live, and can be explained only by biblical creation.

It is therefore not really amazing that the advance of mathematics, as the development of modern science which mathematics undergirds, took place only in the Christian West. Other societies, including the ancient Greeks who gave us Pythagoras and Euclid, were crippled by their religious belief in an ever-existing, cyclical universe. As Nickel states, "the match that lit the fires of the Scientific Revolution was the conviction that the biblical God had designed the universe in a rational and orderly fashion; in fact, so orderly that it could be described mathematically" (p. 40).

The book is divided into a longer part describing mathematics in history, and a shorter part giving an outline of how Christian teachers should teach mathematics. The first part would make excellent collateral reading in Christian high schools and college freshman classes. The second part is of greatest interest to the teacher of mathematics in Grades 6-12. Even the non-mathematician will be fascinated by the section "The Wonders of God's Creation" (pp. 83-92) filled with beautiful illustrations and fine tables on, for example, the mathematical harmony of music and the prevalence of the Fibonacci numerical sequence (1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34 etc.) in God's creation. Each of the eight chapters is followed by questions for review and discussion and footnotes, and there is a fine select bibliography.

Highly recommended especially for teachers and students of history and mathematics.

—Reviewed by Ellen Myers

Clip and mail to:

CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE
AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY
1429 N. Holyoke
Wichita, Kansas 67208

- ☐ Enclosed is my payment of \$15* for Sustaining Membership dues. I subscribe to the Creation Social Science and Humanities Society's *Statement of Belief*:
1. The Bible is the written Word of God. It is inspired and inerrant throughout. Its assertions are historically and scientifically true in all the original autographs. To the student of the social sciences and humanities this means that the account of origins in Genesis is a factual presentation of simple historical truths.
 2. All basic types of living things, including man, were made by direct creative acts of God during the Creation Week described in Genesis. Whatever biological changes have occurred since Creation Week have accomplished only changes within the original created kinds.
 3. The great Flood described in Genesis, commonly referred to as the Noachian Flood, was an historic event worldwide in its extent and effect.
 4. We are an organization of Christian men and women who accept Jesus Christ as our Lord and Saviour. The account of the special creation of Adam and Eve as one man and woman in the image of God and their subsequent fall into sin is the basis for our belief in the necessity of a Saviour for all mankind. Therefore, salvation can come only through accepting Jesus Christ as our Saviour.

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ ZIP _____

*(\$20 U.S. if you reside outside the USA).

- ☐ Enclosed is non-member subscription fee of \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) for one year's subscription to the **CSSHs Quarterly**.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ ZIP _____

DEVOTIONAL

Charles Spurgeon on Nehemiah 3:8 1

LETTERS & ANNOUNCEMENTS

Summer Creation Conferences 2

REASON, FAITH AND CREATION IN THE MATURE
PHILOSOPHY OF LEV SHESTOV

Ellen Myers 3

CREATION, THE FALL AND THE IDEA OF PROGRESS

Ellen Myers 13

1291 - 1991: BURIAL OF SEVEN CENTURIES
OF SWISS CHRISTIAN HISTORY

Pauline Pretre 20

SHARING IN CHRIST'S SUFFERINGS AND GLORY:
THE CHURCH'S CALLING BEFORE CHRIST'S RETURN

Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. 23

BOOK REVIEWS

Judith A. Reisman and Edward W. Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex and
Fraud: The Indoctrination Of A People* 28

Gerard J. Keane, *Creation Rediscovered* 30

James Nickel, *Mathematics: Is God Silent?* 32

Creation Social Science
& Humanities Society
1429 N. Holyoke (316) 683-3610
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Non-Profit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Wichita, Kansas Permit No. 1536

MO ASSN FOR CREATION 992
405 N SAPPINGTON RD
GLENDALE MO 63122